

REMARKS

Claims 1-16 are pending in the present application. The Examiner rejected the claims as follows. Claims 1-8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,282,419 B1 (Findikli) in view of International Publication No. WO 01/17125 A1 (Soliman). Claims 9-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Findikli in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,324,399 B1 (Salmivalli) and further in view of Soliman.

Regarding the Examiner's rejection of independent Claim 1, Claim 1 has been amended and is further distinguished.

Findikli teaches an apparatus and a method for improving rescan capability of a telecommunications system searching for an Acceptable Service Provider (ASP) after failure of a given mobile terminal to link with the ASP.

Soliman discloses an apparatus and a method for reducing the search time associated with a handoff of a call from one base station to another base station. The Examiner equates the search window size as taught by Soliman with the search period value as recited in Claim 1. However, as taught by Soliman, the search window size refers to an amount of time spent searching for a pilot signal once the search has begun. In other words, the search window (which the Examiner refers to as a "search window

size,” Office Action, Page 4) refers to the amount of time during which a search is performed (i.e., a window). For example, Soliman discloses reducing the search window size from 160 to 14 chips (e.g., see Page 17, Lines 9-17). This contrasts with the search period value recited in amended Claim 1 wherein the limitation search period value is used for determining a time at which to begin a search, rather than the duration of a search as taught by Soliman.

In contrast with that which is taught by the cited references, amended Claim 1 includes the recitation of an HLR (Home Location Register) for updating the location information of the MS extracted from the MSC, variably setting a search period value for determining a time at which to begin a search at a time of searching for an HPLMN or higher-priority PLMN on the basis of the location information of the MS and transmitting the set search period value to the M, which is neither taught nor suggested by Findikli or Soliman or the combination thereof. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) of Claim 1 be withdrawn.

Regarding the Examiner’s rejection of independent Claim 9, Claim 9 has been amended to include recitations which are similar to those as contained in amended Claim 1. Accordingly, as Salmivalli, which teaches a method for controlling subscriber registrations in a mobile communication system where the subscriber data concerning visiting subscribers is temporarily stored in a visitor location register, does not cure the deficiencies of Findikli and Soliman, it is respectfully submitted that Claim 9 is allowable

for at least the same reasons as set forth above with respect to the rejection of Claim 1.

Withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) of Claim 9 is respectfully requested.

Independent Claims 1 and 9 are believed to be in condition for allowance.

Without conceding the patentability per se of dependent Claims 2-8 and 10-16, these are likewise believed to be allowable by virtue of their dependence on their respective amended independent claims. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of dependent Claims 2-8 and 10-16 is respectfully requested.

Accordingly, all of the claims pending in the Application, namely, Claims 1-16, are believed to be in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference or personal interview would facilitate resolution of any remaining matters, the Examiner may contact Applicants' attorney at the number given below.

Respectfully submitted,



Paul J. Farrell
Reg. No. 33,494
Attorney for Applicant

DILWORTH & BARRESE, LLP
333 Earle Ovington Blvd.
Uniondale, New York 11553
Tel: (516) 228-8484
Fax: (516) 228-8516

PJF/VAG/ml